

the manner that it is written. Secondly, there are in some programs hard federal match required, and if you do have the full general fund appropriation to meet that match, and some programs this would be the case, then the entire amount is gone and maybe that is not all wrong, but nevertheless that could be the effect. It is also true that some small agencies or small programs within an agency the 5% match or 5% reduction in their authorization could well effect salaries or a variety of essentials because they don't have that kind of flexibility and legally you can not transfer from one program to another. Finally, if you want to make an overall 5% reduction in the level of appropriation that the committee has recommended then it would still be more sound to do it selectively than across the board in which case you are inevitably going to cut some appropriations. For example, as written, no general fund appropriation would mean that every aid program which has general fund appropriation, I presume, is intended to not be fully appropriated to the extent that there is a replacement of local property tax existing currently because of state appropriation. Should that appropriation be cut 5% because of the working of LB 285, the statewide lid bill, you will then automatically increase, the permissive increase at least on local government add 5%, the property taxes in those selected programs that would be effected by the amendment. So, I would urge the body not to support the amendment. While it has some political appeal perhaps, its mechanics are such that it would very adversely effect many of the activities that many of you want to see supported. I'd urge you not to support it.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Koch. Senator Newell. Senator Goodrich.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Mr. President and members of the body, I also rise in opposition to Senator DeCamp's amendment. What Senator DeCamp is doing is not a new idea. In fact we figured and figured on it one afternoon here three years ago trying to figure out some way to do it, to do just that. We never did figure out how to do it in the general broad brush approach that Senator DeCamp is taking. What Senator DeCamp is doing is reducing the appropriation by limiting the spending of the appropriation by 5% and then he talks about a 650 million dollars appropriation which automatically establishes legislative intent to the effect that its general fund appropriation, because that is what the general fund appropriation happens to be. However, some agencies are not funded by general funds. They are funded with cash funds, for example, they would not be effected by this cut, unless he words it specifically for that purpose. So there are any number of reasons why you have to reduce a budget with individual entries. The Department of Welfare, for example, shall be reduced in this, this, this and this program, not